

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/718,021 | 11/19/2003 | Brian J. Taylor | 04AB026/YOD ALBR:0142/YOD | 8807 |
| Alexander M. | 7590 10/16/200 Gerasimow | EXAMINER | | |
| Allen-Bradley | Company, LLC | PATEL, DHARTI HARIDAS | | |
| 1201 South Se Milwaukee, W | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| , | | | 2836 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 10/16/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application/Control Number: 10/718,021

Art Unit: 2836

Applicant argues again that use of the Knox reference is improper because the pre appeal panel issued a decision stating "the rejection is withdrawn and a new office action will be mailed". As explained by the examiner, only a portion of the pre appeal was agreed to by the pre appeal panel; that being the rejection of claims 65, 67, 69, 71, 73, and 75. Subsequently, that portion of the action encompassing claims 65, 67, 69, 71, 73, and 75 was rewritten to apply new grounds of rejection, consistent with the panel's findings. It is unfortunate that the form letter mailed out does not have a box to indicate this; however, the examiner is already on record as stating such. The applicant can surely appreciate that the examiner has no reason to fabricate panel decisions on the written record. The rejection given under Knox stands. All arguments regarding Knox have already been responded to in previous actions.

Applicant has submitted new evidence in the form of NEC 70-37 and 70-292, (reproduced below), and states that according to the NEC, "a fault such as a short circuit or ground fault, is not an overload"; and that overload "does not include short circuits or ground faults."

The examiner has reviewed the indicated reproduced portions below (highlighted by the applicant), but does not see any evidence of either of these statements.

The first line refers to devices over 600 volts. The second paragraph states that a separate overload device is selected to trip at no more than 125% (for motors with a temperature rise of 40 degrees Celsius.

FPN No. 1: For over 600 volts, nominal, see Part X.

Application/Control Number: 10/718,021 Page 3

Art Unit: 2836

(1) Separate Overload Device. A separate overload device that is responsive to motor current. This device shall be selected to trip or shall be rated at no more than the following percent of the motor nameptate full-load current rating:

| * | Motors ereate | | ä | marked | service factor 1.15 or | 125% |
|-------------------|------------------|--|----|--------|--------------------------|------|
| * | Motors | | a | marked | temperature rise 40°C or | 125% |
| less All other me | | | to | es | 115% | |

The examiner's position on this issue is maintained. As provided in the EC&M

The basics of molded case circuit breakers document on 11/13/2007, a ground fault is a type of short circuit, specifically a phase to ground short circuit.

/Michael J Sherry/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2836

/D.P./